UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/755,418	01/05/2001	Jorge M. Ferreira	60001.0009US01	4805

27488	7590	10/18/2005

MICROSOFT CORPORATION
C/O MERCHANT & GOULD, L.L.C.
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER
PAULA, CESAR B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 10/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/755,418	FERREIRA ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CESAR B. PAULA	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

  A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *01 August 2005*.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,5-12 and 14-27* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,5-12 and 14-27* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to the RCE filed on 8/1/2005.

This action is made Non-Final.

.

2.   In the amendment, claims 1-3, 5-12, and 14-27 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 11, 19,

and 21 are independent claims.

3.   The rejections of claims 21– 26 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by

Star Office 5.1 Memorandum, and figs (published before1/5/2001), from IDS submitted on

2/10/2005, hereinafter Staroffice, have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Drawings

4.   The drawings filed on 1/5/2001 have been approved by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6.   Claims 1-3, 5-12, 14– 20, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated

by Star Office 5.1 Memorandum, and figs (published before1/5/2001), from IDS submitted on

2/10/2005, hereinafter Staroffice.

Regarding independent claim 1, Staroffice teaches software comment box for

deselecting an "Apply user data" checkbox, and clicking Ok for changing—*activating a privacy*

option comprising computer-implemented instructions, and replacing or updating personal

information, such as an author's name, from the properties of a file. The comment box is

displayed along with the document—*including a comment box visible with a display of the*

document. The author's name is replaced—*enable removal--* with more generic information,

such as date and time of creation/modification—*replacing the one or more pieces of personal*

information displayed in the comment box with generic information without deleting the

document (memorandum, shots 1-2).

Regarding dependent claim 2, Staroffice teaches software for deselecting an "Apply

user data" checkbox, and clicking Ok for changing—*saving the first document--*, and replacing

or updating personal information, such as an author's name, from the properties of a file

(memorandum, shots 1-2).

Regarding dependent claim 3, Staroffice teaches software for deselecting an "Apply user data" checkbox, and clicking Ok for changing, and replacing or updating personal information, such as an author's name, from the properties of a file (memorandum, shots 1-2).

Regarding dependent claim 5, Staroffice teaches software for deselecting an "Apply user data" checkbox, and clicking Ok for changing—*saving the first document--*, and replacing or updating personal information, such as an author's name-- *generic information made up of string of letters--* from the properties of a file (memorandum, shots 1-2).

Regarding dependent claim 6, Staroffice teaches software for deselecting an "Apply user data" checkbox, and clicking Ok for changing and replacing—*removes one or more pieces of personal information from display in the comment box of the first document--*, personal information, such as an author's name, from the properties of a file (memorandum, shots 1-2).

Regarding dependent claim 7, Staroffice teaches software for deselecting an "Apply user data" checkbox, and clicking Ok for changing—*saving the first document removes one or more pieces of personal information from the first document when the first document is saved--*, and replacing or updating personal information, such as an author's name, from the properties of a file (memorandum, shots 1-2).

Regarding dependent claim 8, Staroffice teaches replacing or updating personal information, such as an author's name, in a comment box, from the properties of a file

(memorandum, shots 1-2). In other words, the same document—*template*-- is used to replace the updated information thereby creating a new or second document containing the updated information.

Claim 9 is directed towards a system for implementing the steps found in claim 1, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Claim 10 is directed towards a computer-readable medium having instructions for executing the steps found in claim 1, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Regarding independent claim 11, Staroffice teaches the default selection of a "Apply user data" checkbox, in a comment box displayed along with a document, enabling the display of an author's name –*receiving input of one or more pieces of personal information into one or more data storage fields in response to a request for personal information from a document-generating application*--. Software dialog comment box is used for deselecting an "Apply user data" checkbox, and clicking Ok for changing—*activate a computer-implemented privacy option*, and replacing or updating personal information, such as an author's name, from the properties of a file as displayed in the comment box. The author's name is replaced—*removal*-- with more generic information, such as date and time of creation/modification—*replacing the one or more pieces of personal information with generic information for display in the comment box* (memorandum, shots 1-2).

Claims 12, 14-16 are directed towards a method equivalent to the steps found in claims 3, 5, 7, and 1 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Claim 17 is directed towards a system for implementing the steps found in claim 11, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Claims 18-20 is directed towards a computer-readable medium having instructions for executing the steps found in claims 11, and 1-2 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 27, which depends on claim 1, Staroffice teaches software for deselecting an "Apply user data" checkbox in a dialog box, and clicking Ok for changing— *activating the privacy option enables removal of personal information from the comment box without removing the comment--* and replacing or updating personal information, such as an author's name, from the properties of a file, which are displayed in a dialog box—*comment box*—along with a document (memorandum, shots 1-2).

7.　　　Claims 21– 26, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Redlich et al, hereinafter Redlich, (USPub.# 2003/0051054 A1, 3/13/2003, provisional filed on 11/13/2005).

Regarding independent claim 21, Redlich teaches enabling a user to designate security levels, on various types documents-- *electronic document created by a document-generating*

application and having a memory representation which is visible to a user when the document is

being viewed from the file representation which is saved to computer-readable media, which

enable other users to a access the document in full or partially based upon their security levels—

providing, and receiving input to activate a privacy option comprising computer-implemented

instructions. Personal information is substituted, and stored in the document.—*removal, and*

replacement of one or more pieces of personal information with generic information from the

memory representation and from the file representation without deleting the document (0097,

0100, 0164-0168).

Regarding claim 22, which depends on claim 21, Redlich teaches that personal

information is substituted when stored in the document (0105, 0125, 0164, 0167-0168).

Regarding claim 23, which depends on claim 21, Redlich teaches that personal

information is substituted based upon user's command (0097, 0105, 0164, 0167-0168).

Regarding claim 24, which depends on claim 21, Redlich teaches that personal

information is substituted when stored in the document (0097, 0100, 0164, 0167-0168).

Claim 25 is directed towards a system for implementing the steps found in claim 21, and

therefore is similarly rejected.

Claim 26 is directed towards a computer-readable medium having instructions for executing the steps found in claim 21, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Response to Arguments

8.   Applicant's arguments filed on 6/29/2005 have been considered but are not persuasive. The Applicants remark that Staroffice fails to teach or suggest displaying a comment box visible with the display of a document (pages 9-12). The Examiner disagrees, because Staroffice teaches that the comment box is displayed along with the document—*including a comment box visible with a display of the document.* The author's name is replaced—*enable removal--* with more generic information, such as date and time of creation/modification—*replacing the one or more pieces of personal information displayed in the comment box with generic information without deleting the document* (memorandum, shots 1-2).

9.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 21-26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicants indicate that Starofice does not teach or suggest the newly amended claim (pages 12-13). The Applicants are directed towards the new rejections above addressing the amended claims.

Conclusion

I.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Markus et al. (Pat. # 6,490,601 B1).

II.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (571) 272-4128. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on (571) 272-4124. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, go to http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair. Should you have any questions about access to the Private PAIR system, please contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866 217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
Or faxed to:
- **(571)-273-8300 (for all** Formal communications intended for entry)

CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER
10/14/05